

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 STATE 092318
ORIGIN NODS-00

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /001 R

66011

DRAFTED BY: EUR/CE:GCHESTER

APPROVED BY: EUR/CE:RDVINE

EUR/CE:DANDERSON

S/S-MR TARNOFF

-----240200Z 099145 /70

O 240109Z APR 77 ZFF4

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION USBERLIN IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BERLIN IMMEDIATE

S E C R E T STATE 092318

NODIS

STADIS

FOLLOWING REPEAT BONN 6926 ACTION SECSTATE DTD 22 APR

QTE

S E C R E T BONN 06926

NODIS

STADIS

FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY HARTMAN AND EUR/CE DAVID
ANDERSON

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, PGOV, WB, GW, US, UR, UK, FR

SUBJECT: BERLIN: REPLY TO SOVIET DEMARCHE ON
MILITARY PATROLS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 092318

REFS: (A) BONN 6882; (B) STATE 87758; (C) STATE 86351

SUMMARY: AS REQUESTED BY REF B, THE BONN GROUP MET
ON APRIL 20 AND 21 TO DISCUSS A PROPOSED REPLY TO THE
SOVIET DEMARCHES. THE PROPOSED BONN GROUP DRAFT IS CONTAINED IN
REF A. THE BONN GROUP TEXT APPEARS TO US TO BE SOME-

WHAT FIRMER IN TONE THAN THE US DRAFT (REF C) BUT NOT SO ABRUPT AS THE FRENCH. THE ONLY SUBSTANTIVE EXCISIONS FROM THE US DRAFT SEEM TO BE THE REFERENCES TO THE GDR, DIRECT REFERENCES TO THE SOVIET TOURS IN WEST BERLIN AND A RESPONSE TO THE SOVIET CLAIM THAT THE PATROLS ARE AN IRRITANT. ACTION REQUESTED: DEPARTMENTS COMMENTS. END SUMMARY

1. THE BONN GROUP DISCUSSED THE PROPOSED REPLY TO THE SOVIET NOTE TRIPARTITELY (US, UK, FRANCE) ON APRIL 20 AND QUADRIPARTITELY ON APRIL 21. THE DISCUSSION ON APRIL 20 WAS FOCUSED ON THE DRAFT US REPLY (REF C) AND ON THE ORAL REPLY WHICH HIBBERT MADE AT THE TIME OF DELIVERY OF THE SOVIET NOTE IN LONDON. IT WAS AGREED THAT THE UK REP (EYERS) WOULD PRESENT A NEW DRAFT, BASED ON THE US DRAFT AND THE HIBBERT REPLY, ON APRIL 21. THERE FOLLOWS A DESCRIPTION OF THE CONTENT AND REASONING BEHIND THE BONN GROUP DRAFT (REF A).

2. THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE BONN GROUP DRAFT IS TAKEN FROM THE US DRAFT.

3. WITH RESPECT TO THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF THE US DRAFT, BOTH EYERS AND THE FRENCH REP (DE BOISSIEU) WERE OF THE VIEW THAT IT WAS MORE APPROPRIATE FOR INCLUSION IN THE US THAN IN THE UK AND FRENCH REPLIES. IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THIS WAS THE SECOND TIME THE SOVIETS HAD MADE A FORMAL DEMAND TO THE US FOR THE CESSATION OF PATROLS, THE APRIL 15 DEMARCHE TO THE US
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 092318

SEEMED PARTICULARLY MODERATE IN TONE. IT WAS SUGGESTED THEREFORE THAT THE US MIGHT WISH TO USE THE SUBSTANCE OF SUCH A PARAGRAPH IN AN ABBREVIATED FORM AS AN ORAL STATEMENT AT THE TIME OF DELIVERY OF THE REPLY. (FYI, IF DEPARTMENT DEEMS IT ESSENTIAL TO INCLUDE THE TEXT OF PARAGRAPH 2 OF US DRAFT IN US NOTE, EYERS AND DE BOISSIEU HAVE NO OBJECTION ALTHOUGH PREFERENCE IS OF COURSE FOR CONFORMING TEXT.) REFERENCE TO AN IMPROVED SITUATION IN EUROPE (SECOND SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 2 OF THE US DRAFT) IS MADE IN PARAGRAPH 5 OF THE BONN GROUP DRAFT.

4. THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF THE BONN GROUP DRAFT IS FROM HIBBERT'S ORAL REPLY. IT IS SEEN AS DEFINING WHAT IS REALLY AT ISSUE.

5. THE THIRD AND FOURTH PARAGRAPHS OF THE BONN GROUP DRAFT ARE AN AMALGAM OF THE US DRAFT AND THE HIBBERT REPLY. THEY SEEK TO EXPLAIN THE LEGAL FOUNDATION FOR

THE RIGHT TO UNDERTAKE PATROLS SINCE THE PATROLS ARE NOT EXPLICITLY CALLED FOR BY ANY FOUR-POWER AGREEMENTS BUT ARE GROUNDED IN PRACTICE. THIS CONFORMS TO THE SUBSTANCE OF THE US DRAFT'S PARAGRAPH 3. WITH RESPECT TO THE US REFERENCES TO THE US (I.E., ALLIED) UNDERSTANDING AND INTERPRETATION OF THE QUADRIPARTITE AGREEMENT AND DECLARATION, IT WAS FELT THAT THIS SUGGESTS PERHAPS TOO STRONGLY THAT THE AGREEMENT AND DECLARATION ADMIT OF DIFFERING INTERPRETATIONS BY THE USSR AND THE ALLIES. WHILE THIS IS IN FACT TRUE, THE PREFERENCE WAS NOT TO ADMIT IT. THE DIRECT REFERENCE TO SOVIET TOURS IN WEST BERLIN WAS OMITTED BECAUSE THE SOVIETS CAN (AND DO) CLAIM THEY ARE INHERENTLY DIFFERENT. EYERS WOULD NOT ALLOW EXPLICIT MENTION OF SOVIET PATROLS CALLING IT A "PROVOCATIVE" SUGGESTION OF A QUID PRO QUO.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 092318

6. WITH RESPECT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE US DRAFT, IT IS QUESTIONABLE WHETHER THIS IS THE BEST TIME TO ARGUE THAT THE PATROLS ARE IN FACT UNOBTRUSIVE. IT WAS ALSO QUESTIONED WHETHER IT IS DESIRABLE TO RESPOND TO THE ARGUMENT THAT THE PATROLS ARE AN ANNOYANCE TO THE GDR SINCE THIS IS IRRELEVANT TO THE ALLIED LEGAL RIGHT TO PATROL. THE SOVIETS HAVE ALREADY MADE THE POINT THAT THEY DO NOT CARRY OUT PATROLS AS SUCH BUT TRAVEL TO SPECIFIED PLACES WHERE THEY HAVE A DIRECT INTEREST. IF THE NUISANCE QUESTION WERE TO BE RELEVANT, THE SOVIETS WOULD APPEAR TO HAVE THE STRONGER ARGUMENT.

7. THE SUBSTANCE OF PARAGRAPH 5 OF THE BONN GROUP DRAFT IS DERIVED FROM PARAGRAPH 5 OF THE US DRAFT. THE US REP NOTED THAT THE PHRASE "AT THIS CRITICAL POINT IN EAST-WEST RELATIONS" STRENGTHENED THE ALLIED ARGUMENT BY EMPHASIZING THE FACT THAT NEITHER THE PATROLS NOR BERLIN CAN BE VIEWED IN ISOLATION BUT THAT WHAT AFFECTS BERLIN CAN HAVE EFFECTS ELSEWHERE. EYERS AND DE BOISSIEU AGREED THAT THIS WAS TRUE IN THE CASE OF THE US, I.E., THAT US/USSR RELATIONS MAY BE SEEN TO BE AT A PARTICULARLY CRITICAL POINT, BUT THAT THE PHRASE BORE LESS, IF ANY, RELEVANCE IF UTTERED BY THEIR GOVERNMENTS. THE FRG REP (HENZE) SAID HE HAD "STRONG RESERVATIONS" ABOUT THE PHRASE BECAUSE IT MIGHT SUGGEST THAT, AT SOME LESS CRITICAL POINT, WE WOULD BE MORE ACCOMMODATING. AS A MIDDLE GROUND, EYERS SUGGESTED THE US MIGHT WANT TO INCLUDE THE PHRASE AS ORAL STATEMENT. HENZE REMAINED UNCONVINCED AND ASKED THAT WE REPORT HIS DISSENT.

8. WITH RESPECT TO THE REQUEST IN REF B THAT THE
REPLY SHOULD QUESTION THE SOVIET MOTIVES, EYERS HAD
NO SUCH INSTRUCTION AND DE BOISSIEU, WHO DID HAVE,
THOUGHT SUCH AN INCLUSION INAPPROPRIATE. AT OUR URGING,
HOWEVER, THE PHRASE IN BONN GROUP PARAGRAPH 5 "THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 05 STATE 092318

SOVIET DEMARCHE MUST PUT IN DOUBT THE WILLINGNESS OF
THE SOVIET UNION TO CONTINUE THE POLICY OF DETENTE OF
WHICH THE QUADRIPARTITE AGREEMENT IS A BASIC ELEMENT"
WAS INCLUDED IN AN ATTEMPT TO RESPOND TO THIS
REQUIREMENT.

9. THE LAST PARAGRAPH IS ALSO TAKEN FROM THE LAST
PARAGRAPH OF THE US DRAFT. "ACCEPTS" WAS SUBSTITUTED
FOR "SHARES," (WITH THE US REP RELUCTANTLY CONCURRING
IN ORDER TO REACH AGREEMENT) ON THE GROUND THAT
"SHARES" WAS TOO FORTHCOMING. THE LANGUAGE WAS ALSO
CHANGED TO REFER ONLY TO THE SOVIET DEMARCHE NOT
BEING MADE "A MATTER OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION" SINCE IT
WAS FELT THAT AGREEMENT NOT TO DRAW UNNECESSARY
ATTENTION TO "THE MATTER OF THE TOURS BY FLAG VEHICLES"
COULD SUGGEST THAT WE INTENDED TO REDUCE THE TOURS
THEMSELVES OR TO MAKE THE TOURS THEMSELVES LESS PUBLIC.
FYI, EYERS COMMENTED THAT THE UK WILL ATTEMPT TO
MAKE THEIRS LESS EVIDENT (HE WAS ALREADY AWARE OF THE
NIGERIAN MOTORCADE INCIDENT) BUT APPARENTLY FEELS
THERE IS NO NEED TO TELL THIS TO THE SOVIETS IN THE
NOTE.

10. ON A RELATED MATTER, EYERS SAID THE QUESTION OF
INFORMING THE BERLIN SENAT OF THE DEMARCHES HAD BEEN
RAISED BY THE UK MISSION IN BERLIN. HENZE SUGGESTED
THAT THE SENAT WOULD HAVE TO BE TOLD. EYERS (SUP-
PORTED BY THE FRENCH AND US REPS) STRONGLY URGED THAT
THIS NOT BE DONE UNTIL AFTER THE REPLY TO THE SOVIET
NOTE HAD BEEN DELIVERED. THE US REP (SUPPORTED BY
EYERS AND DE BOISSIEU) ASKED THAT, IN VIEW OF THE
SENSITIVITY OF THE SUBJECT, THE FRG FOREIGN OFFICE
GIVE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION TO NOT INFORMING THE
SENAT AT ALL SINCE THE SENAT'S PENCHANT FOR PUBLIC
DISCLOSURE IS WELL KNOWN. HENZE SAID THEY WOULD
DISCUSS THIS IN THE FOREIGN OFFICE AND SUGGESTED A
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 06 STATE 092318

POSSIBLE COURSE WOULD BE TO INFORM ONLY SENATOR STOBBE,

WHO IN TURN WOULD BE TOLD TO INFORM ONLY GOVERNING
MAYOR SCHUETZ.
STOESSEL UNQTE VANCE

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DEMARCHE, TEXT, BERLIN ACCESS, CAT-A, GOVERNMENT REACTIONS, BERLIN QUADRIPARTITE MATTERS, POLICE FORCES, MILITARY VEHICLES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 24-Apr-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 22 May 2009
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977STATE092318
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: EUR/CE:GCHESTER
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: N770002-0692
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 2
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770425/aaaaavdd.tel
Line Count: 227
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: d2e316a0-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN NODS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: NODIS, STADIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: NODIS, STADIS
Reference: 77 BONN 6882, 77 STATE 87758, 77 STATE 86351
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03-Feb-2005 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2711453
Secure: LOCK1
Status: NATIVE
Subject: BERLIN: REPLY TO SOVIET DEMARCHE ON MILITARY PATROLS SECRET
TAGS: PFOR, PGOV, WB, GE, US, UR, UK, FR
To: USBERLIN BERLIN
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/d2e316a0-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009